

REMARKS

Claims 21-40 are pending. Claims 1-20 and 38-40 are currently canceled. Claims 38-40 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 21, 25, 32 and 35 are currently amended. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 21-37 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that there is no antecedent basis for the limitation “releasably coupling structure” in claim 21 and for the limitation “guide structure” in claims 21 and 32. This rejection of these claims is unclear and respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 expressly recites, in part:

said application structure including **at least one element** for applying the adhesive-backed film to said first surface and **guide structure** for properly locating said adhesive-backed film relative to said applying element and said first surface, said guide structure having a movable guide surface capable of being located in a first position corresponding to a first dimension of said adhesive-backed film and a second position corresponding to a second dimension of said adhesive-backed film; and

releasably coupling structure for releasably coupling said movable guide surface in said first position. (Emphasis Added)

Thus, claim 21 clearly recites that the application structure includes at least one element as well as guide structure and that the inventive tool comprises releasably coupling structure as a separate element in the claim. Claim 32 provides similar antecedent support for the term “guide structure”. In addition, please note that the term “guide structure” is equivalent to “a guide structure”, and the term “releasably coupling structure” is equivalent to “a releasably coupling structure”.

It is submitted that the rejection of claims 21-37 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 21-24, 30, 32-34 and 37 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kang (US 6,601,630).

Claims 21 and 32 have been amended to expressly recite that the application structure is “pivotably” coupled to the directing structure. Kang does not disclose, teach or suggest such a structure feature. Therefore, this rejection of claims 21-24, 30, 32-34 and 37 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the finding that claims 25-29 and 35-36 would be allowable, if rewritten to overcome the above §112 rejection and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is submitted that claims 25 and 35 have been so amended and, therefore, these claims are allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 16, 2010

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By: /Harold C. Knecht III/

Harold C. Knecht III, Reg. No.: 35,576
Telephone No.: 651-575-1056